



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS
Washington, D.C. 20231
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/185,212	11/03/1998	HIROSHI MAEDA	48742	5152

7590

10/16/2002

Dike, Bronstein, Roberts & Cushman
Intellectual Property Practice Group
EDWARDS & ANGELL
P.O. Box 9169
Boston, MA 02209

EXAMINER

WALLERSON, MARK E

ART UNIT

PAPER NUMBER

2622

DATE MAILED: 10/16/2002

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

Application No.
09/185,212

Applicant(s)
Maeda et al

Examiner
Mark Wallerson

Art Unit
2622



-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136 (a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on Aug 7, 2002.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11; 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-4 and 6-17 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above, claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-4 and 6-17 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claims _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
- 11) ☐ The proposed drawing correction filed on _____ is: a) ☐ approved b) ☐ disapproved by the Examiner.
If approved, corrected drawings are required in reply to this Office action.
- 12) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 119 and 120

- 13) ☒ Acknowledgement is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
a) ☒ All b) ☐ Some* c) ☐ None of:
- ☒ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 - ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 - ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
- *See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.
- 14) ☐ Acknowledgement is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e).
a) ☐ The translation of the foreign language provisional application has been received.
- 15) ☐ Acknowledgement is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 120 and/or 121.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|---|---|
| 1) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s). _____ |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152) |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s). _____ | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: |

Art Unit: 2622

Part III DETAILED ACTION

Notice to Applicant(s)

1. This action is responsive to the following communications: amendment filed on **8/7/2002**.
2. This application has been reconsidered. Claims 1-4 and 6-17 are pending.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

3. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

4. **Claims 1-4, 6-10, 12, 16, and 17** are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Suzuki (U. S. 5,923,013) in view of Tanaka et al. (hereinafter referred to as Tanaka) (U. S. 5,682,549).

With respect to **claim 1**, Suzuki discloses an image processing device (72) comprising image data input means (76 or 110, figure 12) for inputting image data; image data storage means (80) for storing the image data (column 8, lines 29-34); image data confirmation (identifying) means (78) for confirming (identifying) the characteristics (content) of the image data (column 5, lines 14-19; column 6, lines 56-64, and column 8, lines 11-28); management table means (92,

Art Unit: 2622

figure 13) for managing on an image basis as each image data is inputted from the input means (which reads on managing a print job on a job basis and on a page basis) (the abstract, lines 1-2, column 8, line 58 to column 9, line 16, and column 11, lines 29-35) the characteristics of each image data as management information of image data (column 8, lines 42-49 and column 8, line 58 to column 9, line 9) with reference to the corresponding data stored in the image data storage means (80) (column 8, line 58 to column 9, line 9), and image processing means (82) for performing image processing with respect to the image data (column 8, lines 29-35).

Suzuki differs from claim 1 in that although he discloses sending the image data to the storage means, he does not clearly disclose that the management table manages input request information indicative of a request for transmitting the image data from the image processing means and input completion information indicative of the completion of an input of the image data in connection with the corresponding information stored in the image data storage means.

Tanaka discloses an image data management system comprising a management table wherein input request and input completion requests are managed by the management table (column 8, lines 20-38). Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to have modified Suzuki wherein input request and input completion requests are managed by the management table. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to have modified Suzuki by the teaching of Tanaka in order to easily store, manage, and output the image data as disclosed by Tanaka in column 2, lines 13-15.

Art Unit: 2622

With regard to **claim 2**, Suzuki discloses means for setting a processing mode of the image processing means (column 12, lines 29-44).

With respect to **claim 3**, Suzuki discloses that the management table (92) further includes a mode management section (which reads on the job description file) (column 8, lines 58-61) for managing a processing mode (which reads on the number of print copies) as management information of the image data (column 16, lines 18-34), with reference to the image data stored in the storage means (which reads on saved job description files) (column 16, lines 13-17).

With regard to **claim 4**, Suzuki discloses an image processing management section (92) for performing image processing with respect to the image data based on the management information of the management table means (92) (column 11, lines 19-42).

With regard to **claim 6**, Suzuki discloses image output means (72) outputting the processed image data (column 9, lines 33-45), wherein the management table (92) further includes a management output section (94) for outputting the image data from the output means according to the management information (column 8, lines 46-57 and column 9, lines 33-45).

With respect to **claims 7-10**, Suzuki discloses that the management table produces a table consisting of a table for managing information relating to the image data and processing conditions for the image data (column 8, line 58 to column 9, line 8), document ID information (column 8, lines 42-45), an image ID (contents ID) (column 4, lines 61-64), and an output image ID (page ID) for identifying each page of processed image data (column 4, lines 58-60)

Art Unit: 2622

With respect to **claim 12**, Suzuki discloses that the image data is for use in a computer (host system) (column 4, lines 51-54), and that the image data input means (76) is interface means for receiving data from the computer (figure 12).

With regard to **claim 16**, Suzuki discloses second image data storage means (100) for storing image data processed by the image data processing means (column 8, lines 36-41 and column 9, lines 33-45), the management table having means for managing the image data stored in the second image data storage means in connection with the corresponding management information (column 8, line 36 to column 9, line 16).

With respect to **claim 17**, Suzuki discloses second data storage means (90 or 100) for storing an image data which is subjected to image processing by the image processing means (column 8, lines 36-41 and column 9, lines 33-39); image outputting means (102) for outputting the processed second image data from the second image storage means (column 9, lines 39-43), management table means (92, figure 13) for managing output request information indicative of a request for transmitting the image data from the image output means (which reads on to execute a print job, reading the image data to be printed from the data memory, and sending the image data to the printer) (column 9, lines 23-45).

Suzuki differs from claim 17 in that he does not clearly disclose that the management table manages input request information indicative of a request for transmitting the image data from the image processing means and input completion information indicative of the completion of an input

Art Unit: 2622

of the image data in connection with the corresponding information stored in the image data storage means.

Tanaka discloses an image data management system comprising a management table wherein input request and input completion requests are managed by the management table (column 8, lines 20-38). Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to have modified Suzuki wherein input request and input completion requests are managed by the management table. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to have modified Suzuki by the teaching of Tanaka in order to easily store, manage, and output the image data as disclosed by Tanaka in column 2, lines 13-15.

5. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

6. **Claim 11** is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Suzuki in view of Tanaka as applied to claim 1 above, and further in view of Morikawa (U. S. 5,960,247).

Suzuki as modified differs from claim 11 in that he does not clearly disclose that the image input means is a document image reading means for reading the image data of a document image.

Art Unit: 2622

Morikawa discloses a method of processing image data using a management table (figure 6) where a scan system (10) is used for reading the image data of an original (document) (column 3, lines 15-21). Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to have modified Suzuki as modified wherein the image input means is a document image reading means for reading the image data of a document image. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to have modified Suzuki as modified by the teaching of Morikawa in order to allow the processing of print jobs on paper sheets.

7. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

8. **Claim 13** is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Suzuki in view of Tanaka as applied to claim 1 above, and further in view of Kusumoto (U. S. 6,088,135).

Suzuki as modified differs from claim 13 in that he does not clearly disclose that the image data is image data for use in a facsimile machine, and that the input means is a facsimile interface means for receiving data from the facsimile machine.

Kusumoto discloses means for processing image data using a management table (figure 11), wherein the image data may be image data for use in a facsimile machine (column 1, lines 5-

Art Unit: 2622

10 and lines 25-30). Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to have modified Suzuki as modified wherein the image data is image data for use in a facsimile machine, and the input means is a facsimile interface means for receiving data from the facsimile machine. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to have modified Suzuki as modified by the teaching of Kusumoto in order to be able to control the image processing in a facsimile by utilizing a management table.

9. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

10. **Claims 14 and 15** are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Suzuki in view of Tanaka.

With respect to claim 14, Suzuki discloses an image processing device (72) comprising image data input means (76 or 110, figure 12) for inputting image data; input data management table means (92, figure 13) for managing each image data on an image data basis as each image data is inputted from the input means (which reads on managing a print job on a job basis and on a page basis) (the abstract, lines 1-2, column 8, line 58 to column 9, line 16, and column 11, lines 29-35); first data storage means (80) for storing the image data (column 8, lines 29-34); image

Art Unit: 2622

processing means (82) for performing image processing with respect to the image data (column 8, lines 29-35); second data storage means (90 or 100) for storing an image data which is subjected to image processing by the image processing means (column 8, lines 36-41 and column 9, lines 33-39); management table means (92, figure 13) for managing input request information indicative of a request for transmitting the image data from the image processing means (which reads on to execute a print job, reading the image data to be printed from the data memory, and sending the image data to the printer) (column 9, lines 23-45) the characteristics of each image data as management information of image data (column 8, lines 42-49 and column 8, line 58 to column 9, line 9) with reference to the corresponding data stored in the image data storage means (80) (column 8, line 58 to column 9, line 9).

Suzuki differs from claim 14 in that he does not clearly disclose that the management table manages input request information indicative of a request for transmitting the image data from the image processing means and input completion information indicative of the completion of an input of the image data in connection with the corresponding information stored in the image data storage means.

Tanaka discloses an image data management system comprising a management table wherein input request and input completion requests are managed by the management table (column 8, lines 20-38). Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to have modified Suzuki wherein input request and input completion requests are managed by the management table. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary

Art Unit: 2622

skill in the art at the time of the invention to have modified Suzuki by the teaching of Tanaka in order to easily store, manage, and output the image data as disclosed by Tanaka in column 2, lines 13-15.

With respect to **claim 15**, Suzuki discloses image outputting means (102) for outputting the processed second image data from the second image storage means (column 9, lines 39-43), wherein the management table means (92, figure 13) manages output request information indicative of a request for transmitting the image data from the image output means (which reads on to execute a print job, reading the image data to be printed from the data memory, and sending the image data to the printer) (column 9, lines 23-45).

Suzuki differs from claim 15 in that although he discloses sending the image data to the storage means, he does not clearly disclose that the management table manages input request information indicative of a request for transmitting the image data from the image processing means and input completion information indicative of the completion of an input of the image data in connection with the corresponding information stored in the image data storage means.

Tanaka discloses an image data management system comprising a management table wherein input request and input completion requests are managed by the management table (column 8, lines 20-38). Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to have modified Suzuki wherein input request and input completion requests are managed by the management table. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to have modified Suzuki by the teaching of Tanaka in

Art Unit: 2622

order to easily store, manage, and output the image data as disclosed by Tanaka in column 2, lines 13-15.

Response to Arguments

11. Applicant's arguments filed 8/7/2002 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

Applicant submits that *Tanaka* “does not clearly teach, disclose, or suggest that each image data input is managed by a management table on an image basis as each data is inputted from the image data input means”. The Examiner respectfully disagrees.

Tanaka CLEARLY an image data management system for taking in information written on paper as image data and outputting the image data as individual data (column 1, lines 38-42), inputting image data from an inputting device and determining whether a data format has already been registered in the input management table (column 6, lines 41-51). The image data is **clearly** being managed by the management table as each data is inputted (column 6, line 41 to column 7, line 13). It is unclear why Applicant pointed out certain references to “sent page number” (column 6, lines 14-41 and column 7, lines 22-30) and “data and hour of image data inputting” (column 7, lines 4-6), but neglected to point out references to “inserting page number 611”; “the number of inserting pages” and “a registering data format”, all in column 6, lines 19-21, which indicates that the management table is managing the input data as it is being inputted.

Art Unit: 2622

Suzuki also discloses managing image data on an image basis as each image data is inputted from the input means (which reads on managing a print job on a job basis and on a page basis) (the abstract, lines 1-2, column 8, line 58 to column 9, line 16, and column 11, lines 29-35).

Conclusion

12. All claims are rejected.

13. **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL.** Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 C.F.R. § 1.136(a).

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR RESPONSE TO THIS FINAL ACTION IS SET TO EXPIRE THREE MONTHS FROM THE DATE OF THIS ACTION. IN THE EVENT A FIRST RESPONSE IS FILED WITHIN TWO MONTHS OF THE MAILING DATE OF THIS FINAL ACTION AND THE ADVISORY ACTION IS NOT MAILED UNTIL AFTER THE END OF THE THREE-MONTH SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD, THEN THE SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD WILL EXPIRE ON THE DATE THE ADVISORY ACTION IS MAILED, AND ANY EXTENSION FEE PURSUANT TO 37 C.F.R. § 1.136(a) WILL BE CALCULATED FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THE ADVISORY ACTION. IN NO EVENT WILL THE STATUTORY PERIOD FOR RESPONSE EXPIRE LATER THAN SIX MONTHS FROM THE DATE OF THIS FINAL ACTION.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Mark Wallerson whose telephone number is (703) 305-8581.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application should be directed to the Group receptionist whose telephone number is (703) 305-4700.

Any response to this action should be mailed to:

Commissioner of Patents and Trademarks
Washington, DC 20231

or faxed to:

Art Unit: 2622

(703) 872-9314 (for formal communications intended for entry)

(for informal or draft communications, such as proposed amendments to be discussed at an interview; please label such communications "PROPOSED" or "DRAFT")

or hand-carried to:

Crystal Park Two
2121 Crystal Drive
Arlington, VA.
Sixth Floor (Receptionist)



MARK WALLERSON
PRIMARY EXAMINER

Mark Wallerson